Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/596,775	BOUDARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ka Chun Leung	3741	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
(1) <u>Ka Chun Leung</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Nicolas E. Seckel</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 24 October 2008.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1-22</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>N/A</u> .			
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In the restriction requirement mailed on 09/08/2008, an election of species requirement was raised which was not fully addressed in the Applicant's response filed on 10/16/2008. After review, the Applicant's representative elected to prosecute Species I directed towards the embodiment detailed in Figure 1 including three-way valves.			
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.			
/Ka Chun Leung/			